

Application No. 10/015,680

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of May 25, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Of these, Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent. In this Amendment, Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added.

**35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 - 21 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hogle, IV (5,923,307). In order for a rejection under 35 USC § 102(b) to be valid the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicant's claimed invention may be briefly summarized as follows:

Hogle IV teaches how to arrange multiple monitors in a logical space to form a contiguous, non-overlapping region.

Applicant's claimed invention (independent amended Claims 1, 11, and 21) is a system for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more display areas, where each display area has a given resolution and the resolution of at least one display area is different than the resolution of the other display areas. The system utilizes an image replicator to associate image information with each display. A viewer is then used to transform the image information for each display such that when the images are displayed on their respective display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the displayed image and

Application No. 10/015,680

the displayed resolution of at least one of the images is different from the displayed resolution of at least one other of the displayed images.

Hogle IV, does not, and indeed can not, scale an image to provide a continuous display with portions displayed in different resolutions. In Hogle IV, the total displayable screen area or virtual screen area is determined as an aggregate of the number of pixels contained in each of the screen areas. Hence when a screen area changes its resolution (for instance becoming larger by going to a size with more pixels such as 1024x768, or smaller by going to a size with fewer pixels such as 800x600) then the total displayable portion must be recalculated to either remove the overlap in the logical space caused by the larger screen size or to remove gaps in the logical space caused by the smaller screen size (please see column 11, lines 48-59). The effect of this is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens will be displayed across the two screens and the image portions will be adjacent to each other, the entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size. However, when this is done all images are displayed at the same resolution. Therefore, with Hogle IV your choice is to have either a perceived continuous image with one resolution on all displays or a discontinuous image using different resolutions on different displays.

Note that while Hogle IV states in column 2 lines 1-8 that " In one aspect of the invention, a computer system arranges multiple monitors in logical space to form a contiguous and non-overlapping region" that this is referring to the formation of a contiguous display space NOT to the formation of a continuous image displayed across multiple display areas wherein the

Application No. 10/015,680

resolution of the displayed image on one display area is different from the resolution of the displayed image on at least one other of the displayed areas as claimed by Applicant. This difference is easily illustrated by comparing Figures 9(a) and 9(b) from Hogle IV with Figure 2 and the description thereof on pages 12 and 13 of applicant's specification.

In Figures 9(a) and 9(b) of Hogle IV, when the resolution of a display is changed the *displayed* image size changes. The resolution in Figure 9(a) of 1024x768 has a smaller pixel size than the resolution in Figure 9(b) of 800x600. As the exact same pixels are being displayed in both cases, the image appears larger in Figure 9(b) because the pixels are physically larger. The result in Hogle IV then is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens is displayed across the two screens with the image portions adjacent to each other, the entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size. However, when this is done all images are displayed at the same resolution. Therefore, with Hogle IV your choice is to have either a perceived continuous image with one resolution of display or a discontinuous image using different resolutions.

However, in Figure 2 of applicant's disclosure along with the description contained on pages 12 and 13 of applicant's specification there is clearly shown an image of the letter "k" across two areas having different resolutions and pixel sizes. The portion of the image displayed in the area having the larger pixel size is referred to as the context area, while the portion of the image displayed in the area having the smaller pixel size is referred to as the focus area. The specification clearly points out that "if the image in the focus

Application No. 10/015,680

area were either enlarged or reduced relative to the image displayed in the context area this would ... introduce discontinuities in the [displayed] image." Figure 2, is the illustration of Applicant's claimed invention wherein image portions of a source image are provided to two or more display areas and are scaled such that when the image portions are displayed on the two or more display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of at least one portion of the source image is different from the displayed resolution of at least one other portion of the source image.

Although the Office Action states that Hogle IV "teaches the displayed resolution of the image displayed on at least one of the at least two display areas being different from the displayed resolution of the image displayed on at least one other of the at least two display areas (taught as the reconfiguring of varying -resolution displays in a contiguous, non-overlapping workspace, at col.11, lines 48-59....), this is not what Hogle IV teaches. Hogle IV does not teach maintaining a continuous image as claimed by Applicant but rather allows discontinuities of image introduced by varying pixels sizes and instead performs the much simpler adjustment of locating the displays in logical space to form a contiguous and non-overlapping region of display space. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size. However, when this is done all images are displayed at the same resolution. Therefore, with Hogle IV your choice is to have either a perceived continuous image with one resolution of display on ALL the displays or a discontinuous image using different resolutions on different displays.

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of displays with varying resolution capabilities and preserve a continuous image across the displays by appropriately transforming the images for each of the displays.

Application No. 10/015,680

Therefore, as transforming the images to provide a continuous image with at least one portion displayed in a different resolution is not taught nor is it inherently present, each and every element is not taught and Hogle IV does not meet the requirements of a valid rejection under 35 USC § 102. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection be removed and submits that Applicant's Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are now in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Insofar as claims 2 – 10, 12 and 14 - 20 are concerned, these claims all include the limitations of and depend from now presumably allowable claims 1 or 11 and are also believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claims 1 and 11 above.

#### **Reconsideration/Admittance Requested**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

#### **Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time Statement**

A three month Extension of Time is believed to be required for this amendment. The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney (or agent) hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Application No. 10/015,680

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Nola Mae McBain, at Telephone Number 650-812-4264, Palo Alto, California.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nola Mae McBain", written over a horizontal line.

Nola Mae McBain  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 35,782  
(650) 812-4264

Date: November 22, 2005